IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,	
Plaintiff,	
v.)	Case No. 05-cv-329-GKF(SAJ)
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,	
) Defendants.)	

STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S RESPONSE TO "THE CARGILL DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO QUASH SECOND AMENDED RULE 30(B)(6) NOTICES AND FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER" [DKT #1683 & #1684]

Plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma, ex rel. W.A. Drew Edmondson, in his capacity as Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment C. Miles Tolbert, in his capacity as the Trustee for Natural Resources for the State of Oklahoma ("the State") respectfully requests that "The Cargill Defendants' Motion to Quash Second Amended Rule 30(b)(6) Notices and for Protective Order" [DKT #1683 & #1684] ("the Motion") be denied for the reasons that follow.

Introduction

The Cargill Defendants' Motion is nothing but another example of the Cargill Defendants' continuing effort to thwart and stall the State's efforts to secure 30(b)(6) testimony on issues of vital importance to this case. To wit:

1. Some 9½ months ago -- on July 13, 2007 -- the State first served 30(b)(6) deposition notices on the Cargill Defendants. *See* Exs. 1 & 2 to DKT #1244. The Cargill Defendants objected and refused to produce properly prepared 30(b)(6) designees. Accordingly, on August 16, 2007, the State brought a motion to compel. *See* DKT #1244. After briefing and

oral argument on the issue, on October 24, 2007, the Court set the parameters for required preparation of 30(b)(6) designees. *See* DKT #1336.

- 2. Some 4½ months ago -- on December 21, 2007 -- the State renoticed the 30(b)(6) depositions of the Cargill Defendants for January 30 and 31, 2008. *See* Exs. 1 & 2 to DKT #1469. In an effort to accommodate a request from the Cargill Defendants, the State proposed narrowing the 30(b)(6) notices so that those topics most pertinent to issues pertaining to the State's Preliminary Injunction Motion would be covered at depositions on January 30, 2008, and the remaining topics would be covered at depositions following the preliminary injunction hearing. *See* Exs. 3, 5 & 6 to DKT #1469. Rather than respond to this good faith effort by the State to accommodate the Cargill Defendants, the Cargill Defendants sought to postpone these depositions until after the preliminary injunction hearing. *See* DKT #1453, #1474, #1484 & #1493; *see also* Exs. 7 & 9 to DKT #1469. By its February 1, 2008 Order, the Court postponed the 30(b)(6) depositions of the Cargill Defendants until after the preliminary injunction hearing. *See* DKT #1502.
- 3. On March 24, 2008, the State again renoticed the 30(b)(6) depositions of the Cargill Defendants. See Ex. 2 to DKT #1683. The depositions were scheduled for April 22, 23, 29 & 30 -- more than a month out from the date of service of the notices. See Ex. 2 to DKT #1683. Despite this month-long lead time, the Cargill Defendants refused to produce one of its designees on the requested dates, citing scheduling issues. See Ex. 1 (April 3, 2008 Letter). Specifically, the designee whom the Cargill Defendants refused to produce on the dates noticed was the designee addressing corporate organization / structure issues whom the State needed to

depose first.¹ By letter dated April 18, 2008, the Cargill Defendants reiterated this refusal to produce the designee addressing corporate organization / structure issues in the order requested by the State and on the dates noticed by the State. *See* Ex. 3 to DKT #1683. Accordingly, by email dated April 18, 2008, the State confirmed the fact that the Cargill Defendants were refusing to produce the noticed 30(b)(6) designee on April 22 & 23, 2008. *See* Ex. 3 (April 18, 2008 Email). This same day, the Cargill Defendants also filed their Motion.²

This delay in the production of these responsive documents has prejudiced the State. Indeed, it serves to underscore the dilatory discovery tactics of the Cargill Defendants: first, they say their production is complete when it is not; next they collect additional responsive documents but keep this fact from the State for (at least) three months, and then they offer to allow the State to review the documents but fail to comply with this Court's dictates as to document productions. Obviously, the State is entitled to, and reserves all rights to, redepose the Cargill Defendants' 30(b)(6) designees on the contents of these improperly withheld documents once proper production of them occurs and the State has had the opportunity to review them.

In any event, and additionally, the Cargill Defendants quite correctly acknowledge in their Motion that the State should be allowed to supplement its expert reports as to the Cargill

Indeed, the earliest the Cargill Defendants were willing to produce this designee was on May 22 or 23 -- a full month after the date set forth in the deposition notice. *See* Ex. 2 (April 7, 2008 letter). Apparently recognizing the weakness of their position, the Cargill Defendants in their moving papers state that the designee can be produced earlier than the previously offered date of May 23.

As in the "Cargill Defendants' Separate Response to Plaintiffs' [sic] Motion to Expand the Discovery Period" [DKT #1645], the Cargill Defendants' Motion also makes reference to the approximately 200 boxes believed to contain documents relevant to corporate knowledge and / or the categories discussed during the parties' July 19, 2007 meet and confer that the Cargill Defendants have failed to properly produce to the State. Significantly, included within these approximately 200 boxes are documents that the Court has already ordered the Cargill Defendants to produce, see July 6, 2007 Order, and documents that the Cargill Defendants have stated they have already agreed to produce. Yet, despite having known of these responsive documents for many months (and perhaps as early as August 2007), it was only on the date of the filing of their Motion (April 18) that the Cargill Defendants offered to allow the State the opportunity to review these documents. See Ex. 3 to DKT #1683. Moreover, the Cargill Defendants still have not produced an index complying with this Court's requirements pertaining to the production of documents (known as the "Cargill Rule"). See DKT #1150 & #1207. Finally, it should be noted that the Cargill Defendants still have not explicitly corrected their representation to the Court of a year ago concerning the status of their document production. See April 27, 2007 Hearing Transcript, 94:2-4 ("I will make a representation to the Court that we have completed our hard copy production, Cargill has").

Argument

This Court has previously ruled that the party seeking discovery is the master of the scheduling and may set both the order in which depositions are to be taken and the dates on which depositions may be taken. See, e.g., DKT #1425 (requiring State to produce its preliminary injunction expert witnesses in the order and on the dates proposed by Defendants). The State, quite logically, is seeking to take the deposition of the designee knowledgeable about the Cargill Defendants' corporate organization / structure issues prior to taking the deposition of the designee knowledgeable about core liability issues since corporate organization / structure issues are a foundational predicate to the core liability issues. Furthermore, in a scheduling accommodation to the Cargill Defendants, the State gave the Cargill Defendants a month-long lead time in the deposition notices. Compare LCvR 30.1(a)(2) ("reasonable notice to parties as contemplated by Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(1) for the taking of depositions shall be five (5) days"). Yet the Cargill Defendants nevertheless have refused to tender the 30(b)(6) designee on corporate organization / structure issues on the dates requested, thereby delaying not only the deposition of this designee, but also the deposition of the core liability issues. This delay is severely prejudicial to the State in its trial preparations.³

While it does not disagree that when possible a party noticing a deposition should make reasonable efforts to accommodate the opposing party's schedule, the State has been extraordinarily patient in trying to secure the 30(b)(6) deposition testimony of the Cargill

Defendants due to the untimely production of these documents (or any other reason that should become apparent). *See* Motion, p. 2. One "other reason" justifying supplementation of its expert reports as to the Cargill Defendants that is already readily apparent is the Cargill Defendants' continued delay in the tendering of their 30(b)(6) designees.

As noted in footnote 2 above, the Cargill Defendants have freely admitted that delays in their discovery compliance warrant allowing the State to supplement its expert reports as to the Cargill Defendants. *See* Motion, p. 2. The State reserves all rights to do so.

_

Defendants these past 9½ months. However, at some point accommodation must yield to the necessities of case preparation and the demands that the scheduling order puts on that case preparation. Simply put, the fact that one may have competing business commitments or obligations does not rise to the level of "good cause" necessary to establish an entitlement to a protective order or a motion to quash -- particularly when there has already been a 9½-month delay in securing these depositions and in light of the important environmental and public health issues raised by this case. Accordingly, the Cargill Defendants' Motion should be denied, and the Cargill Defendants' 30(b)(6) designees should be tendered for deposition at a time and place of the State's choosing.⁴

Respectfully Submitted,

W.A. Drew Edmondson OBA # 2628 ATTORNEY GENERAL Kelly H. Burch OBA #17067 J. Trevor Hammons OBA #20234 Tina Lynn Izadi OBA #17978 Daniel P. Lennington OBA #21577 ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL State of Oklahoma 313 N.E. 21st St. Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-3921

Consistent with these principles, the State is entitled to take <u>separate</u> depositions of the Cargill Turkey Production and Cargill, Inc. designees. Consolidating the depositions of the Cargill Turkey Production and Cargill, Inc. designees into single depositions would create a thoroughly confused record unless Cargill Turkey Production and Cargill, Inc. agree that they are one-and-the-same.

s/Robert A. Nance

M. David Riggs OBA #7583
Joseph P. Lennart OBA #5371
Richard T. Garren OBA #3253
Sharon K. Weaver OBA #19010
Robert A. Nance OBA #6581
D. Sharon Gentry OBA #15641
David P. Page OBA #6852
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS
502 West Sixth Street
Tulsa, OK 74119
(918) 587-3161

Louis W. Bullock OBA #1305 Robert M. Blakemore OBA 18656 BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE 110 West Seventh Street Suite 707 Tulsa OK 74119 (918) 584-2001

Frederick C. Baker (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Lee M. Heath (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth C. Ward (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth Claire Xidis (admitted *pro hac vice*)
MOTLEY RICE, LLC
28 Bridgeside Boulevard
Mount Pleasant, SC 29465 (843) 216-9280

William H. Narwold (admitted *pro hac vice*) Ingrid L. Moll (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE, LLC 20 Church Street, 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103 (860) 882-1676 Jonathan D. Orent (admitted *pro hac vice*) Michael G. Rousseau (admitted *pro hac vice*) Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE, LLC 321 South Main Street Providence, RI 02940 (401) 457-7700

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 5^{th} day of May, 2008, I electronically transmitted the above and foregoing pleading to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and a transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General
Kelly H. Burch, Assistant Attorney General
J. Trevor Hammons, Assistant Attorney General
Tina Lynn Izadi, Assistant Attorney General
Daniel P. Lennington, Assistant Attorney General
M. David Riggs
Joseph P. Lennart
Richard T. Garren
Douglas A. Wilson
Sharon K. Weaver
Robert A. Nance
D. Sharon Gentry
David P. Page

fc_docket@oag.state.ok.us
kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us
trevor_hammons@oag.state.ok.us
tina_izadi@oag.state.ok.us
daniel.lennington@oag.ok.gov
driggs@riggsabney.com
jlennart@riggsabney.com
rgarren@riggsabney.com
doug_wilson@riggsabney.com
sweaver@riggsabney.com
rnance@riggsabney.com
sgentry@riggsabney.com
dpage@riggsabney.com

RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS

Louis Werner Bullock Robert M. Blakemore BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE lbullock@bullock-blakemore.com bblakemore@bullock-blakemore.com

Frederick C. Baker Lee M. Heath Elizabeth C. Ward Elizabeth Claire Xidis William H. Narwold Ingrid L. Moll Jonathan D. Orent

fbaker@motleyrice.com lheath@motleyrice.com lward@motleyrice.com cxidis@motleyrice.com bnarwold@motleyrice.com imoll@motleyrice.com jorent@motleyrice.com Michael G. Rousseau Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick MOTLEY RICE, LLC mrousseau@motleyrice.com ffitzpatrick@motleyrice.com

Counsel for State of Oklahoma

Robert P. Redemann rredemann@pmrlaw.net
Lawrence W. Zeringue lzeringue@pmrlaw.net
David C. Senger dsenger@pmrlaw.net
PERRINE, MCGIVERN, REDEMANN, REID, BARRY & TAYLOR, P.L.L.C.

Robert E Sanders rsanders@youngwilliams.com
Edwin Stephen Williams steve.williams@youngwilliams.com

YOUNG WILLIAMS P.A.

Counsel for Cal-Maine Farms, Inc and Cal-Maine Foods, Inc.

John H. Tucker jtucker@rhodesokla.com
Theresa Noble Hill thill@rhodesokla.com
Colin Hampton Tucker ctucker@rhodesokla.com
Leslie Jane Southerland ljsoutherland@rhodesokla.com

RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES, TUCKER & GABLE

Terry Wayen West terry@thewestlawfirm.com

THE WEST LAW FIRM

Delmar R. Ehrich dehrich@faegre.com
Bruce Jones bjones@faegre.com
Dara D. Mann dmann@faegre.com
Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee kklee@faegre.com
Todd P. Walker twalker@faegre.com

FAEGRE & BENSON, LLP

Counsel for Cargill, Inc. & Cargill Turkey Production, LLC

James Martin Gravesjgraves@bassettlawfirm.comGary V Weeksgweeks@bassettlawfirm.comPaul E. Thompson, Jrpthompson@bassettlawfirm.comWoody Bassettwbassett@bassettlawfirm.comJennifer E. Lloydjlloyd@bassettlawfirm.com

BASSETT LAW FIRM

George W. Owens
Randall E. Rose
gwo@owenslawfirmpc.com
rer@owenslawfirmpc.com

OWENS LAW FIRM, P.C.

Counsel for George's Inc. & George's Farms, Inc.

A. Scott McDaniel smcdaniel@mhla-law.com
Nicole Longwell nlongwell@mhla-law.com
Philip Hixon phixon@mhla-law.com
Craig A. Merkes cmerkes@mhla-law.com

MCDANIEL, HIXON, LONGWELL & ACORD, PLLC

Sherry P. Bartley sbartley@mwsgw.com MITCHELL, WILLIAMS, SELIG, GATES & WOODYARD, PLLC

Counsel for Peterson Farms, Inc.

John Elrod jelrod@cwlaw.com
Vicki Bronson vbronson@cwlaw.com
P. Joshua Wisley jwisley@cwlaw.com
Bruce W. Freeman bfreeman@cwlaw.com
D. Richard Funk rfunk@cwlaw.com

CONNER & WINTERS, LLP Counsel for Simmons Foods, Inc.

Stephen L. Jantzen sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com
Paula M. Buchwald pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com
Patrick M. Ryan pryan@ryanwhaley.com

RYAN, WHALEY, COLDIRON & SHANDY, P.C.

Mark D. Hopsonmhopson@sidley.comJay Thomas Jorgensenjjorgensen@sidley.comTimothy K. Webstertwebster@sidley.comThomas C. Greentcgreen@sidley.comGordon D. Toddgtodd@sidley.com

SIDLEY, AUSTIN, BROWN & WOOD LLP

Robert W. George robert.george@tyson.com
L. Bryan Burns bryan.burns@tyson.com

TYSON FOODS, INC

Michael R. Bond michael.bond@kutakrock.com
Erin W. Thompson erin.thompson@kutakrock.com

KUTAK ROCK, LLP

Counsel for Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., & Cobb-Vantress, Inc.

R. Thomas Lay rtl@kiralaw.com

KERR, IRVINE, RHODES & ABLES

Jennifer Stockton Griffin David Gregory Brown LATHROP & GAGE LC jgriffin@lathropgage.com

Counsel for Willow Brook Foods, Inc.

Robin S Conrad rconrad@uschamber.com

NATIONAL CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER

Gary S Chilton gchilton@hcdattorneys.com

HOLLADAY, CHILTON AND DEGIUSTI, PLLC

Counsel for US Chamber of Commerce and American Tort Reform Association

D. Kenyon Williams, Jr. kwilliams@hallestill.com Michael D. Graves mgraves@hallestill.com

HALL, ESTILL, HARDWICK, GABLE, GOLDEN & NELSON

Counsel for Poultry Growers/Interested Parties/ Poultry Partners, Inc.

Richard Ford richard.ford@crowedunlevy.com
LeAnne Burnett leanne.burnett@crowedunlevy.com

CROWE & DUNLEVY

Counsel for Oklahoma Farm Bureau, Inc.

Kendra Akin Jones, Assistant Attorney General Kendra.Jones@arkansasag.gov Charles L. Moulton, Sr Assistant Attorney General Charles.Moulton@arkansasag.gov

Counsel for State of Arkansas and Arkansas National Resources Commission

Mark Richard Mullins richard.mullins@mcafeetaft.com

MCAFEE & TAFT

<u>Counsel for Texas Farm Bureau; Texas Cattle Feeders Association; Texas Pork Producers Association and Texas Association of Dairymen</u>

Mia Vahlberg @gablelaw.com

GABLE GOTWALS

James T. Banks jtbanks@hhlaw.com Adam J. Siegel ajsiegel@hhlaw.com

HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP

<u>Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Poultry and Egg Association & National Turkey Federation</u>

John D. Russell jrussell@fellerssnider.com

FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC

William A. Waddell, Jr. waddell@fec.net
David E. Choate dchoate@fec.net

FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP

Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation

Barry Greg Reynolds reynolds@titushillis.com
Jessica E. Rainey jrainey@titushillis.com
TITUS, HILLIS, REYNOLDS, LOVE,

DICKMAN & MCCALMON

Nikaa Baugh Jordan njordan@lightfootlaw.com William S. Cox, III wcox@lightfootlaw.com

LIGHTFOOT, FRANKLIN & WHITE, LLC

Counsel for American Farm Bureau and National Cattlemen's Beef Association

Also on this $\underline{5}^{th}$ day of May, 2008, I mailed a copy of the above and foregoing pleading to the following:

David Gregory Brown

Lathrop & Gage, LC 314 E. High Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Thomas C. Green

Sidley Austin Brown & Wood, LLP 1501 K St. NW Washington, DC 20005

Cary Silverman Victor E. Schwartz Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP 600 14th St. NW, Ste. 800

Washington, DC 20005-2004

C. Miles Tolbert

Secretary of the Environment State of Oklahoma 3800 North Classen Oklahoma City, OK 73118

Dustin McDaniel Justin Allen

Office of the Attorney General (Little Rock) 323 Center Street, Suite 200 Little Rock, AR 72201-2610

Steven B. Randall

58185 County Road 658 Kansas, Ok 74347

George R. Stubblefield

HC 66, Box 19-12 Proctor, Ok 74457

s/Robert A. Nance

Robert A. Nance